

1776 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006
PHONE 202.719.7000
FAX 202.719.7049

7925 JONES BRANCH DRIVE McLEAN, VA 22102 PHONE 703.905.2800 FAX. 703.905.2820

www.wileyrein.com

### RECEIVED

## 2013 JUN 11 PM 12: 42 FEC MAIL CENTER

June 11, 2013

Jan Witold Baran 202.719.7330 jbaran@wlleyrein.com

#### BY HAND

Mr. Mark Allen Office of General Counsel Federal Election Commission 999 E Street, NW Washington, DC 20463

Re: Supplemental Response to MUR 6563

Dear Mr. Allen:

I am writing to follow up on our recent telephone conversations during which I confirmed that my client, Congressman Eric Cantor, received your letter of May 10, 2013. That letter stated that the Commission notified Congressman Cantor on May 3, 2012, of a complaint (the "Complaint") in Matter Under Review ("MUR") 6563 alleging violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"). I informed you that Congressman Cantor has no record of receiving the May 3, 2012, notification letter. You indicated to me that the FEC also has no record of receipt. Accordingly, notice of the Complaint to Congressman Cantor did not occur until your most recent letter. Please accept this letter as his response to the Complaint.

On June 12, 2012, this office responded to the Complaint on behalf of our other clients, Every Republican Is Crucial (ERICPAC) and its Treasurer. I enclose and incorporate that response here by reference. The response explains why the Commission should dismiss our clients as respondents to this MUR. The reasons stated therein apply with equal force to Congressman Cantor. Accordingly, he too should be dismissed as a respondent to this MUR.

First, the Complaint does not identify any of our clients – including Congressman Cantor – as a respondent. Second, the Complaint does not contain a single allegation of a violation by our clients. Although the FEC's May 3, 2012, letter states that the Complaint "indicates" that Congressman Cantor may have violated

Congressman Cantor received a May 8, 2013, notification of a separate complaint in MUR 6733 that is based on the same events and alleges essentially the same violations as the Complaint in this MUR. On May 20, 2013, this office filed a Statement of Designation of Counsel on behalf of Congressman Cantor in MUR 6733. In an email to me dated May 22, 2013, you confirmed that the Statement of Designation of Counsel in MUR 6733 would also suffice for this office's representation of Congressman Cantor in MUR 6563.



Mr. Mark Allen June 11, 2013 Page 2

the Act, the letter fails to explain how. This does not constitute adequate notice of a violation of the Act to Congressman Cantor. Accordingly, Congressman Cantor should be dismissed as a respondent to this MUR at the threshold.

In addition, the Complaint does not allege any facts that constitute a violation of the Act by Congressman Cantor. The Complaint invokes Congressman Cantor's name in two places. First, the Complaint's factual recitation states that Congressman Schock solicited Congressman Cantor for a \$25,000 contribution to the Campaign for Primary Accountability ("CPA") and that ERICPAC – Congressman Cantor's leadership PAC – made a contribution to CPA. Second, the Complaint alleges that "Rep. Schock's solicitation of a \$25,000 contribution from Rep. Cantor" was a violation of 2 U.S.C. § 441(e)(1) by Congressman Schock.<sup>2</sup>

In contrast, the Complaint does not allege that Congressman Cantor violated 2 U.S.C. § 441(e)(1), or any other provision of the Act. In fact, Congressman Cantor did not solicit any improper contributions; the activity associated with Congressman Cantor in the Complaint – that ERICPAC made a \$25,000 contribution to CPA – is entirely lawful under the Act as interpreted by Commission precedent.

In Advisory Opinion 2007-29, the Commission concluded that a Congressman "may donate an unlimited amount of funds from his principal campaign committee" and is "not restricted by 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e)(1)" because the funds in a principal campaign committee comply with the amount and source restrictions of the Act. Like a Congressman's principal campaign committee, a Congressman's leadership PAC also consists of funds that comply with the amount and source restrictions of the Act. Therefore, ERICPAC was permitted to contribute unlimited funds to CPA in full compliance with 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e)(1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e)(1) prohibits a federal candidate, officeholder, or an agent of either, including an entity established, financed, maintained or controlled by a federal candidate or officeholder, from soliciting, receiving, directing, transferring, or spending funds in connection with federal or nonfederal elections unless the funds comply with the amount and source restrictions of the Act.



Mr. Mark Allen June 11, 2013 Page 3

The Complaint does not provide notice of a violation of the Act by Congressman Cantor. Furthermore, the Complaint's description of Congressman Cantor's activity is entirely consistent with the Act and 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e)(1) as confirmed by a Commission advisory opinion. Therefore, Congressman Cantor – like ERICPAC and its Treasurer – should be dismissed as a respondent to this MUR.

Sincerely,

Jan Witold Baran

Cc: Caleb P. Burns

**Enclosure** 

RECEIVED .



investigation

# FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION 999 E Street, NW Washington, DC 20463

2819 MAY 20 PM 2: 42

## STATEMENT OF DESIGNATION OF COUNSEL Please use one form for each Respondent/Entity/Treasurer FAX (202) 219-3923

WUR # <u>6/33</u>	
NAME OF COUNSEL: Jan Witold Baran & Caleb F. Burns	
FIRM: Wiley Rein LLP	20
ADDRESS: 1776 K Street, NW	
Washington, DC 20006 TELEPHONE- OFFICE (202) 719-7000	- N = 1
FAX ( 202 ) 719-7049	
	nated as my counsel and is one from the Commission and Member of Congress  Title (Treasurer/Candidate/Owner)
TELEPHONE · HOME ()  BUSINESS ()  Information is being sought as part of an investigation being conducted by the confidentiality provisions of 2 U.S.O. § 437g(a)(12)(A) apply. This section pro	and you shall be some

Rev. 2010